

### **REMARKS**

This Amendment is responsive to the Final Office Action dated May 31, 2011. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 12, 25-31, and 34 are cancelled. Claims 1, 4, 7-11, 13-24, 32, 33, and 35-50 are currently pending. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 7, 9, 13, 17, 19, 22 and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The term at issue (“said control server”) has been deleted from the relevant claims. As for claims 25-31, these claims were cancelled. Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph should be withdrawn.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. These rejections are now moot because claims 25-31 are cancelled.

#### **The Prior Art Rejections**

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Iliff (US5935060A). Claims 1, 8-31, 33, 34 and 37-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iliff in view of Iliff '093 (US 6569093B2). Claims 4, 7, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iliff in view of Iliff '093,

and in further view of Chikovani et al. (US 6383135B1). However, it is submitted that the cited prior art does not anticipate nor render obvious each and every feature recited in the present claimed invention, as amended.

For instance, amended claim 1 recites “a calculation means for calculating a score for each symptom in the chief complaint information and consultation information input by said input means, the score corresponding to the degree of the respective symptom and the duration of the respective symptom.” As described in the specification, scoring of the evaluation in the consultation field 151j may be made in correspondence to each of the displayed items in the detail display field 151h (*see, e.g.*, para. [0121]). Likewise, the patient’s chief complaint information preliminarily input is scored (*see, e.g.*, para. [0136]). The detail display field 151h includes “duration of the symptom” (*see, e.g.*, para. [0119]). The patient’s chief complaint information that is input is explained through Figs. 3a, 3b, and 3c (*see, e.g.*, para. [0099]). One of the information input includes the duration-of-pain input field 133b (*see, e.g.*, para. [0108]-[0110]).

As amended, the present claimed invention calculates the score based on two elements, namely both the degree and duration of a respective symptom, to show the correlation between patient’s chief complaint information and doctor’s consultation information, and provides generated graphs in which trends in the scores of the correlation can be viewed. Making such a time-series comparison of the correlation serves as an important indicator for determining the appropriateness of doctor’s therapy and treatment plan. As amended, the claimed invention goes beyond mere evaluation of symptoms as of the time the chief complaint information and the

consultation information is obtained, but rather, includes the duration of the symptom in scoring. The cited prior art does not disclose nor render obvious at least the claimed “means for calculating a score for each symptom in the chief complaint information and consultation information input by said input means, the score corresponding to the degree of the respective symptom and the duration of the respective symptom.”

Furthermore, amended claim 1 recites “wherein if the patient did not appear on a day reserved in a next-reservation information which has been input by said input means, said generation means generates the list with blanks for said chief complaint information and consultation information for the day the patient did not appear.” The generated list includes a reserved date for the next consultation after every finishing doctor’s consulting, and if the patient did not appear on the reserved day, a blank is made for the chief complaint information and consultation information for the reserved day the patient did not appear. This is shown, for example, in Fig. 12a with blank information on 09.24 (*see, e.g.,* para. [0183]).

A doctor generally determines the next reserved date observing the patient’s symptoms each time based upon the trends of correlation between the chief complaint information and the consultation information. This date was determined through the doctor’s therapy and treatment plan based upon expert knowledge and also taking into consideration the amount of a drug prescribed. In the case that the patient did not come on the reserved date despite the doctor’s therapy and treatment plan, it is necessary for the doctor to rearrange his therapy and treatment plan including medicinal benefits prescribed. The blank information is important in order for the doctor to make allowance for a temporal deviation in his anticipated therapy and treatment plan

(see, e.g., para.s [0006], [0009] and [0070]). In addition, the Applicant submits that the present invention revolutionizes the ability of clinicians (and also patients) to “connect the dots” for comprehensive and speedy diagnosis.

In the Office Action, claim 12 was rejected based upon col. 22, lines 24-34 regarding process 490 of Iliff. However, the blank in Iliff is made for the purpose of scheduling a re-enter session to allow a length of time to pass and see if a diagnosis could be reached at a later time. The blank **will be filled in** at any point in the future time in accordance with the purpose of Iliff’s invention. It seems that the purpose of Iliff’s invention is to provide knowledge-based medical diagnostic advice only by identifying the disease. In stark contrast, the purpose of the present invention is not accomplished when the blank is filled in. The purpose of the present invention is to serve the data (including showing the blank fields) to contribute to the doctor’s consideration and adjustment of the therapy and treatment plan, while also identifying the disease. Consequently, the purpose, operation and effect are different between the present invention and the cited prior art, so that both elements of data and data generation processes are quite different between them. Therefore, a person skilled in the art could not have arrived at the present claimed invention based on the cited prior art.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

Application No. 10/578,271  
Art Unit: 3626

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.116  
Attorney Docket No. 062491

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,  
**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**

/John P. Kong/

John P. Kong  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 40,054  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

JPK/af